

FEB 5 1925

The Classical Weekly

Published weekly, on Monday, except in weeks in which there is a legal or School holiday, from October 1 to May 31, at
Barnard College, New York City. Subscription price, \$2.00 per volume.
Entered as second-class matter, November 18, 1907, at the Post Office, New York, N. Y., under the Act of Congress of
March 3, 1879.
Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in Section 1103, Act of October 3, 1917, authorized on
June 28, 1918.

VOL. XVIII, No. 13

MONDAY, JANUARY 26, 1925

WHOLE NO. 490

SATHER CLASSICAL LECTURES

In this series the problems of the classical scholar are treated in a critical and scientific spirit, but the form of presentation makes the volumes unusually attractive to the general reader. Three volumes are now ready. Others will be issued from time to time.

THE UNITY OF HOMER

By JOHN A. SCOTT
Professor of Greek in Northwestern University.

The most brilliant and forceful statement of the unitarian position in the long controversy that has raged since the appearance of Wolf's *Prolegomena*.

AESCHYLEAN TRAGEDY

By HERBERT WEIR SMYTH
Eliot Professor of Greek Literature in Harvard University.

A rare intuition has been here combined with an unusual creative faculty to set forth, for the enjoyment of the reader, the charm, the nobility, and the supreme art of Aeschylus, perhaps the greatest dramatic genius the world has ever known.

HERODOTUS

By T. R. GLOVER
Fellow of St. John's College and Public Orator in the University of Cambridge.

An attractive study of the "Father of History" by one of the most eminent of modern historians. The sympathetic and imaginative treatment gives the volume especial interest for the general reader, and the work is as authoritative as it is brilliant and fascinating.

All who wish to possess complete sets of the Sather Classical Lectures should send in their orders promptly; the editions are not large and some of the volumes will soon be out of print.

The price for each volume is \$3.50 postpaid. The three volumes, if purchased together, may be had for \$10.00 postpaid.

THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA PRESS THE CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS
Berkeley, California London, England

For Supplementary Work in Latin

Reiley's Practical Exercises on the Latin Verb \$.60

Blanks providing for the writing of over 100 verbs which teach the pupil rapidity with thoroughness, economize the time of both teacher and pupil, and make the pupil's acquisition of the verb easy and permanent.

Hurlbut and Bradley's Notebook for First Year Latin Vocabulary \$.32

Teacher's Handbook32

A good way to build up and review the first year Latin vocabulary. The left-hand pages contain all the Latin words met in the first year (650 in number) grouped according to declension or conjugation. The right-hand pages are left blank for the pupil to write in the English meanings as new words are encountered.

Inglis' Latin Composition Exercise Book \$.48

A series of blanks which give the student systematic training in writing Latin. Space is provided for both the original exercises and also sentences to be corrected.

AMERICAN BOOK COMPANY

NEW YORK

CINCINNATI

CHICAGO

BOSTON

ATLANTA

BISHOP AND ROBINSON

Practical Map Exercises and Syllabus in Ancient History

Fourteen map-tracing exercises impress accurately and indelibly the important expansions of Oriental, Aegean, Greek, and Roman civilizations.

The syllabus, which accompanies each map exercise, concretely correlates the geographic background with the political and cultural life of the peoples, and serves as a valuable outline of the whole course for teacher and student.

Here is a handbook for the pupil who would pass the College Entrance Examination in Ancient History *the first time*.

GINN AND COMPANY

Boston New York Chicago London Atlanta Dallas Columbus San Francisco

The Classical Weekly

VOL. XVIII, No. 13

MONDAY, JANUARY 26, 1925

WHOLE NO. 490

LIGHT ON TWO PUZZLES

In THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY 17.9, I asked for light on two puzzles. The puzzles consisted of groups of Latin words which correspondents had sent to me with the request that I solve for them the difficulty which they had themselves found insoluble. Various readers of THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY offered solutions. I had hoped to put these together long ago, but circumstances have delayed the fulfillment of this purpose till now.

I

One puzzle consisted of the following Latin words: *Heu, quanto minus est cum reliquis versari quam vestrum meminisse.* My correspondent had asked the following question: Are these Latin words ancient? if so, who wrote them? He was troubled by the fact that *vestrum*, rather than *vestri*, was used with *meminisse*.

Unfortunately, there is not space here to quote in full, or even to give the substance of all the answers which came to me with respect to this query. To the thanks I have already conveyed to the writers by letter, I hereby add public thanks for the spirit of helpfulness which prompted them to write, in many cases very fully. The best letter of comment came from Mr. Alexander Shewan, of far-off St. Andrews, Scotland. Readers of THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY will remember his fine paper, *Repetition in Homer and Tennyson*, 16. 153-158, 162-166. His letter ran as follows:

By a strange coincidence I saw this sentence for the first time recently, in a paper about my old School. The writer, speaking of departed friends, says, "Shall I not add with Shenstone the words so admired by Landor, 'O quanto minus est cum reliquis versari quam vestri meminisse'", which differs in two respects from the wording given by you.

By a yet stranger coincidence I read only last night—THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY arrived this evening—in Andrew Lang's *History of English Literature*, 585, "With Tacitus his friends might say, 'Quam melius tui meminisse quam cum caeteris versari'". A different reading again.

Looking up Harbottle, *Dictionary of Quotations (Classical)*, I find, "Heu! Quanto minus est cum reliquis versari quam tui meminisse. Shenstone. On an ornamental urn, inscribed to Miss Dolman". Again a slight variation from your version—*tui* for *vestrum*.

I find in Landor's works the following note:

"The tender and virtuous Shenstone, in writing the most beautiful of epitaphs, was unaware how near he stood to Petrarcha. Heu quanto minus est cum aliis versari quam tui meminisse.

Pur mi consola che morir per lei
Meglio è che gior d'altra".

A rough translation of Petrarch's verses would run something like this: 'And yet I have the consolation that dying for her is better than enjoying life with another'.

Miss Nellie Angel Smith, of Florence Hall, Florence, Alabama, called my attention to the fact that, in a book entitled *Dictionary of Latin Quotations, Proverbs, Maxims, and Mottos, Classical and Mediaeval, Including Law Terms and Phrases, With a Selection of Greek Quotations*, by H. C. Riley (London, Henry G. Bohn, 1860), the following passage is to be found, on page 146:

Heu! Quanto minus est cum reliquis versari, quam tui meminisse!—"Alas! how little the pleasure of conversing with those that are left, compared with that of remembering thee". SHENSTONE'S epitaph on Miss Dolman.

"To live with them is far less sweet
Than to remember thee". —MOORE.

I should myself venture a translation somewhat as follows 'Ah me!, how much less a thing it is to live and move and have one's being with all the rest of the world than merely to dwell in thought on you', or, perhaps, 'Merely to recall you is worth more than close intimacy with all the rest of the world'.

Professor David M. Robinson writes that the rendering quoted above from Riley is that of Thomas Moore, the Irish author of *Lalla Rooka*. The rendering occurs in Moore's poem, *I saw thy form in youthful prime*. Moore there quotes the Latin.

Professor C. W. Keyes, of Columbia University, wrote as follows:

William Shenstone, English poet (1714-1763), wrote an inscription on an "Ornamented Urn" in memory of his relative Miss Dolman; it concluded, *Heu. . . tui meminisse!* See Chalmers, *English Poets*, 13.330. These words were used as a 'motto' at the head of Moore's poem, *I saw thy form in youthful prime (Irish Melodies)*, and of Byron's *And thou art dead*.

With respect to the form in which this puzzle appeared in THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY, I would suggest that some one took the motto from Byron's poem, and, wishing to make it apply to more than one person, inserted *vestrum* in his ignorance.

Dr. Alexander Duane, a New York physician who keeps up his interest in the Classics, wrote as follows:

The second <epitaph> I think your correspondent quoted wrongly. It occurs in the following form in the Sigma Phi Catalogue of 1862 and heads the Necrological List: *Heu. . . tui meminisse*.

II

With respect to the other puzzle, I quote a paragraph from THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY 17.9:

Another correspondent sent a clipping from an article (whose source was not indicated) which declared that the great classical scholar Porson wrote, as a motto, over the old tavern known as Cider Cellar's Tavern, at 20 Maiden Lane, Covent Garden, London (a tavern immortalized by Thackeray), the following words:

Honos erit huic quoque homo.

In looking again at the newspaper clipping referred to in the foregoing paragraph, I find attached to the line *Honos erit huic quoque homo*, the following note: "Wheatley's *London*, vol. 2, p. 456".

Of the dozen or more attempts made by various readers of THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY to throw light on this puzzle the most effective was that of Dr. G. L. Scoggan, who at one time was connected with the Department of Classics at the University of Missouri. Later, he was on the editorial staff of the Encyclopedia Britannica, in connection with the three volumes supplementary to the Eleventh Edition that were issued a year or two ago. He is to be Director of the Gennadius Library of the American School of Classical Studies at Athens. The main part of his letter ran as follows:

<The line, as printed in THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY 17.9> is nonsense, due to a misprint found in Wheatley's *London Past and Present* 2.456. The quotation is not cited in Cunningham's earlier *Handbook of London*, of which Wheatley's work is a revision. The true reading of course is to be found in Vergil, second Eclogue, line 53: *Honos erit huic quoque pomo*, 'Honored shall be this fruit, too'.

Many of my correspondents had connected the inscription with Vergil, Eclogue 2.53. One of these was Professor E. K. Rand. He added: "Has not some errant scribe intervened between the inscription and THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY 17.9?"

Mr. Steven T. Byington, the highly accomplished proof-reader of Messrs. Ginn and Company (Atheneum Press, Boston), contributed the following:

I am by trade a proofreader. I note that the proximate source of the quotation is "a clipping", and I am moved to suggest the possibility that *homo* is a misprint for *domo*.

The daily press in our time, especially around your city, is able to accomplish, even in English, even greater miracles of typography than this would be. For instance, I think that the New York Times's mention of a young man sowing his wild *cats* before marriage will strike most people as more remarkable than to print *homo* for *domo*.

If the clipping in question did not seem to be from a daily, and if it be thought that weeklies must be more careful, I may cite the New Republic's achievement in printing "The Old Huntsman" as "The Old Testament".

One correspondent suggested that *homo* was after all the correct reading. Taking the word as a collective singular, he rendered by 'This place too shall have honor—in its guests'. Another correspondent, also accepting *homo*, rendered by 'Man will be an honor to this place also'. But, assuming for the moment that *homo* could be read, we are bound to say that it would be difficult to supply with *huic* a word of such definite meaning as *locus*, especially in a passage wholly without context. There is the further objection to the reading *homo*, as to the reading *domo*, that neither *homo* nor *domo* will 'scan'; there is a distinct dactylic movement in *nós erit huic quoque*.

Mr. Charles B. Gleason, of San José, California, stated that the Cider Cellar Motto is mentioned in Melville, *Thackeray Country*, 127 (A. and C. Black, Edinburgh and London). There *quoque* is omitted¹.

CHARLES KNAPP

THE NATIONAL AND THE COSMOPOLITAN PERIODS OF GREEK AND ROMAN LITERATURE²

The greatest achievement of the classical scholarship or 'Altertumswissenschaft' of the nineteenth century was its accurate appraisal and delineation of classical Greek and Roman civilization. Hence critical scholarship and pedagogical effort were for the most part concentrated on the canonical or classical masterpieces of literature, which were for the first time fully differentiated from the mass of later imitations and spurious accretions. Genuine understanding and appreciation of the Hellenic and Roman contributions to civilization supplanted the uncritical reverence for all ancient lore. But specialization has its disadvantages as well as its advantages. Concentration of interest leads to isolation. Historical periods become water-tight compartments.

One misses to-day the adventurous catholicity of the Italian humanists. For them Greek literature did not end with Theocritus nor Latin literature with Suetonius. We of the twentieth century must continue to discriminate—but let us not be sectarians. The narrowing of the 'classical' field leaves us with fewer contacts and with fewer friends. My purpose in this paper is to consider the character and the interrelation of certain periods of Greek and Latin literature; for I am convinced that the traditional or generally accepted estimate of Greek and Roman literature (especially Roman) at the present day suffers somewhat from a lack of perspective.

As a preliminary, however, to what I have to say about the course of development of the classical literatures, I must protest against the dissociation of Roman literature from Greek. The stream of classical literature has its fountain-head in Greece. In the third century B. C. it divides into two linguistic branches, but both branches are still nourished from the same source. I am not arguing that the Greek and the Roman peoples are alike. Far from it. But (to change the metaphor) Roman literature is a graft on the parent stock of Greek.

The practical application of this point of view is as follows. There can be no history of Roman literature apart from Greek, and within the Christian era there can be no history of Greek literature apart from Latin. The traditional limitations of our standard treatises give a false perspective. One may write a History of Classical Greek Literature, of course, for classical

¹In the article which called forth the present paper, I referred in passing to what I characterized as the motto of New York University—*Perstando et praestando*:

On this Dr. Duane wrote as follows: "On the building of New York University, in Washington Square, the following words are inscribed: *Perstando et praestando utilitati*. A friend of mine, as we passed by the place, asked me what the words meant. I told him I could not parse them". No more can I!

Professor R. V. D. Magoffin, who came to New York University in the fall of 1923 <I myself have lived within a mile of the University Heights part of New York University ever since that part was located there, 20 odd years ago, and I have seen the Washington Square building often>, wrote me that "The official motto of New York University, as you will note by looking at the watermark of this sheet of paper, is *Perstare et praestare*". That does not help me any, for, of course, these three words taken by themselves are not Latin.

²This paper was read at the Eighteenth Annual Meeting of The Classical Association of the Atlantic States, held at the Episcopal Academy, Overbrook, Pennsylvania, May 2, 1924.

Greek literature is an organic whole; but one may not or should not write a History of Roman Literature without at least a pretty thorough survey of Greek literature by way of introduction; and the later periods of Greek or Latin literature can hardly be treated without reference to each other.

But, returning to the development of Greco-Roman literature, we begin with the Hellenic. The classical period of Greek literature is the greatest era of artistic creativeness that the world has ever known. I need not rehearse the literary forms which were invented and perfected for all time by the Greeks in their great age of political and intellectual freedom. But, familiar though it may be, I must emphasize one unique characteristic of this great literature: it was primarily not a writing of books to be read, but a performance or utterance of thoughts to be heard. The recording and the preservation of the spoken word were subsequent or secondary. Thus was begotten the dramatic unity of the forms of classical Greek literature. Even when the historians and the philosophers produced extensive works in prose, the rational quality of oral appeal was retained. Furthermore, classical Greek literature is the record of community life, of public life, of man as a social animal. It is a record of activities in which every citizen had a share. Only in an atmosphere of freedom and selfdetermination could such a literature be developed; when this freedom was crushed by empire, Greek literature was forced into new channels.

We come now to the Alexandrian or Hellenistic period. Under the Macedonian Empire, life became more cosmopolitan and literature denationalized. These are of course relative terms. Hellenistic Greek literature was the literature of the larger Greek and semi-Greek world, no longer divided into many diverse nations and cultural centers. To this degree it was cosmopolitan and denationalized, but not to the degree attained by Greek and Latin literature in the period of the late Roman Empire, when the civilizations of Greece, Rome, and the Orient interacted upon one another and produced the patristic blend of thought.

The literature of the Alexandrian or Hellenistic period, therefore, was pan-Greek, and to this extent cosmopolitan and deprovincialized. Imperialism had brought an end to the untrammeled expression of community life and thought, i. e. to the spontaneous utterances of a selfguiding and selfdetermining society. At the same time there was a distinct evolution in human psychology, away from the communal and towards the individual. All these forces had their influence on literature.

In speaking of Alexandrian or Hellenistic literature I do not refer to what is usually called Alexandrianism, i. e. the pedantry of sterile scholarship. Too much attention is paid in our histories of post-classical Greek literature to the pale heritage of the classical, the academic ghost which stalked in the libraries of Alexandria, the closet-literature of the pedants.

I refer rather to the 'popular' literature which Wilhelm Christ rather lamely calls "Unterhaltungslitteratur". It was this which was destined to live and grow.

Briefly, the new literature is comprised in the forms of novel, story, essay, and treatise. For the majority of people, literature was definitely becoming what it is nowadays—a side-issue, a relaxation, apart from the practical activities of everyday life.

Consequently, literature becomes primarily the writing of books to be read. The individual whim or fancy, the individual voice of protest, the individual sermon is entrusted to the written page, and cast forth to be received by whosoever may chance upon it. The inspiration to creation and the content or message of literature are found not in communal activity, but in the inner life of the individual.

Thus the unique literature of ancient Greece, so difficult to grasp without special study of the life of the times, gives place to a modernized literature, which is much more easily transferable from one people to another. This ease of transmission, this universal cosmopolitan character of literature, is a very important point to keep in mind in tracing the influence of Greek literature on Latin and of Latin literature on the world.

In general the Hellenistic literature is dominated by story-telling. Even philosophies and sciences tend to be put in the story form, which makes so universal an appeal to the human mind.

Let us now turn to the Romans. I need not dwell on the fact that the embryonic forms of a native and spontaneous literature, which existed among the Romans in the third century B. C., were abruptly cast aside when the phenomenally rapid evolution of world-consciousness came upon the Romans during the period of the Punic Wars—an evolution whose only counterpart is the occidentalizing of the Japanese in the nineteenth century.

When the Romans undertook the creation of a national literature to rival the Greek, they had two sets of models before them: (1) the recent and contemporary Hellenistic literature, easy to comprehend and universal in its character; and (2) the already classical literature of early Greece, remote in its grandeur, splendidly provincial, and difficult of comprehension. But many features of Roman political and social life were more analogous to the classical period of Greek independence than to the contemporary cosmopolitanism of the Near East. The result was a mixture—not a fusion, for the two types and conceptions of literature could not be fused, but rather a predominance now of one standard, now of the other. Of course the classical Greek spirit was never apprehended by the Romans in its purity. Artistic creativeness could never have the place in the native Latin community which it had in the Greek. A closer reproduction of the atmosphere of Greek life was to come many centuries later in the city-states of Renaissance Italy.

Let us trace now the development of Roman literature. The pioneer translators and imitators are of little importance, and we know too little of their work to generalize about it. The early vogue of the comedy of manners is of course a clear case of the influence of a non-classical type, cosmopolitan and immediate in its appeal.

During the last century before Christ and the first century of the Christian era the Roman or Latin race stood at the apex of national achievement. In spite of the alien channels of artistic expression, the virile Roman character was portrayed in a truly national literature, hardly comparable to the Greek, but a splendid achievement nevertheless. The Romans themselves now sensed the difference between the classical Greek literature and the contemporary Hellenistic, and notable writers (particularly Cicero and Horace) strove to reproduce the spirit of the classical. Vergil's attempt to combine the national and the universal was a splendid failure. By temperament a scholar and a mystic, steeped in the Hellenistic conceptions of the romantic hero and the personal savior, he took as his pattern the objective Homeric saga and produced a monument of unreality—beloved as a romantic story-book, ever since St. Augustine wept boyish tears over the fate of the heroine.

In the Silver Age the shadow of absolutism was growing ever blacker over the Roman world. Passionately Tacitus and his contemporaries clung to the ideal of an expression of national life. As in a dream world, they recreated the Hellenic spirit. Theirs was the last expression of the spirit of the body politic².

It is significant, that in reviewing classical Roman literature, one passes unconsciously from the Augustan to the Silver Age, ignoring the interlude of the reign of Nero. The Neronian period was in reality a brief glimpse of the coming time, a precursor of the world literature which can be called Latin, but not Roman. The universality of the writings of Seneca and Petronius was perhaps premature; but, had Seneca remained longer in power, the history of European thought might have been very different. After the despotism of Nero the fiction of republicanism was revived, bringing with it the Silver Age as a final flare of the classical traditions of literature.

The Christian or patristic period, foreshadowed by Seneca and others, when a new and greater cosmopolitanism succeeded to that of Hellenistic Greece, begins in the reign of Hadrian, i. e. in the second quarter of the second century of our era. It is a period of vast world-movements. The growing individualism of the human race leads to ever keener interest in personal salvation, in the new concepts of religion, which were to be finally gathered up in Christianity. The *pax Romana* had brought into friendly communion Greeks, Romans, and Orientals. Books were to an increasing degree the medium of world-wide exchange of ideas. With the gradual dying out of the old Greek and Roman *intelligenzia*, there is of course a decline from that rational clarity which characterized classical Greek literature and its immediate heritage. The fusion of races and the infiltration of barbarian stocks contributes to a general decline of intelligence, but all is not decay. There are new and great forces. Mysticism and romanticism show themselves; and even the loss of traditional culture, which seems so regrettable, opens the way for

²It would be interesting to discuss the preponderance of classical or of contemporary Greek influence in each of the great writers of Rome, but that would carry me far beyond the limits of this paper.

the expression of ideas which are closer to the masses. There begins a new birth of spontaneous popular literature.

For Greek literature the new era was a second step away from the strictly national, for the Latin it was the first step. Or perhaps one should say that the classical Greek literature had been so peculiarly provincial that in Greek literature two steps were required to accomplish what the Latin accomplished in one.

Gradually the literature of the era became Christian, but there could be no greater mistake than to isolate the Christian thinkers from the pagan in the patristic period, when all men were aiming at the common goal of personal salvation.

No matter how much of a classicist one may be, he can have no scorn for the patristic era when he meets its perfect simplicity in the story of the Martyrdom of Perpetua and Felicitas (to say nothing of the New Testament), or when he meets its splendid mysticism and psychological penetration in the Confessions of St. Augustine.

For most of this period the Greco-Roman world is a cosmopolitan unit. Only the accident of language separates the two literatures: they are one in spirit. Neither can be considered without the other.

But in the fifth and sixth centuries came political chaos. The great bureaucratic governing machine of the Roman Empire failed; the proletariat became overwhelmingly barbarian; the fruitful exchange of ideas between speakers of the Greek tongue and speakers of the Latin tongue ceased. The Byzantine Greek and the medieval Latin literatures now went their separate ways. For five centuries more the recorded literature of the West was chiefly Latin, and literature was the prerogative of the Church. Whether one call this period the Dark Ages or the Early Medieval, it was not without great names. It left its record behind it in the Latin tongue. It was cosmopolitan and supranational, and it drew its inspiration from the cosmopolitan patristic period.

The quality of supranationalism was now inherent in Latin literature, which continued to play a great part in the Middle Ages proper, when the vernacular literatures began to appear. The tremendous vitality of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries (which deserve a far more positive appellation than the colorless term Middle Ages) found abundant material to express not only in the various national literatures, but in the one great supranational literature as well.

When, finally, the fifteenth century humanists turned away from the ideals of the Middle Ages and revived the intellectual life of pagan Greece and Rome, it is interesting to note that, in seeking to comprehend the long-neglected literature of Greece, they assimilated first the more cosmopolitan and denationalized literature of the Roman and Hellenistic periods, and only after long and painful efforts the genuinely classical. And, even when the treasures of the classical literature were opened to them, it was long before the unique qualities of the genuinely national masterpieces were

appreciated, not in fact (as I said at the beginning of this paper) until the nineteenth century. But this appreciation brought scorn and neglect of the other types of literature produced in the Greek and Latin languages.

And therefore again, as at the beginning, I urge that, while retaining the critical distinctions which have been established, we should enlarge our horizon and include within our view all of Greek and Latin literature, for the better understanding of each and every part.

HAVERFORD COLLEGE

DEAN P. LOCKWOOD

REVIEWS

Paul Viereck: Griechische und Griechisch-Demotische Ostraka der Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek zu Strassburg im Elsass, mit Beiträgen von Wilhelm Spiegelberg. Erster Band: Texte. Berlin: Weidmannsche Buchhandlung (1923). Pp. xv + 356. \$2.40.

It is difficult, in reviewing a work of this sort, to do more than to call attention to the character of its contents and to stress its extraordinary value in enriching our knowledge of the business life of Egypt in Hellenistic and Roman times. For these potsherds which, when considered singly, seem to present little more than dry details of dates, taxes, goods, and names, possess a cumulative value of the highest importance when they are viewed in the light of such a corpus as Professor Viereck affords us in this work. Together with the papyri, which they so admirably supplement in countless ways, they serve to clarify certain phases of ancient economic life. They remain historical sources of unimpeachable veracity, and it is safe to say that their worth will be increasingly recognized by historical students.

The 812 ostraka published in this volume range in date from the fourth century B. C. to the sixth century A. D. They do not comprise the entire Strassburg Collection, for the cost of publication made it necessary for the author to exclude, at the last, some of the smaller, imperfect specimens. The method adopted in each instance is to give first the number of the ostrakon in this volume, followed by its invoice number, and by a brief statement regarding its provenance and its date. Then comes the text, and, finally, the necessary critical commentary. The keen scholarship and great learning which the task demanded are everywhere in evidence, and deserve the fullest praise.

The material is organized into five leading groups, namely A. Receipts, 1-507 (pages 1-159); B. Orders for Delivery, 508-517 (160-162); C. Lists of Names, 518-572 (162-185); D. Accounts, 573-771 (186-264); E. Miscellaneous, 772-812 (265-283). The ostraka of the first and largest group are arranged, according to the formula used, in six classes: (1) treasury receipts for payments of money, under seventeen subdivisions; (2) collectors' receipts for money, under nine subdivisions; (3) warehouse receipts for various supplies, under thirteen subdivisions; (4) collectors' receipts for

various supplies, under ten subdivisions; (5) receipts for payments of an unspecified character, under three subdivisions; and (6) receipts acknowledging performance of labor. Among the last group, E, are several in the form of brief letters, some school exercises in the alphabet, and, most striking of all, a remarkable religious text of the sixth century, running to twenty-four lines (809).

Special mention should be made of the indices which contribute so greatly to the value of this work in the general field of papyrology. In I (283-285) the Emperors mentioned in the book are listed in chronological sequence together with the titles employed; II (285-328) gives a list of proper names which will assure Professor Viereck the gratitude of every scholar working with papyri; III (328-329) presents the titles of priests and officials; IV (330-332) lists taxes, etc.; V (332-334) is devoted to geography and topography, VI (334-335) to coins, weights, and measures, VII (336) to chronology; VIII (336-349) is an elaborate word index; IX (350) is a special index to group E; X (351-352) is devoted to the Demotic texts; and XI (353-356) is a table of invoice numbers with their order in this publication.

The second volume, which is already completed but for whose publication funds are lacking, will be devoted to a complete discussion of the many interesting problems to which these texts give rise. It is, obviously, so indispensable a complement to this admirable volume that one feels compelled to express the earnest hope that the necessary financial support may soon be found.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

J. G. WINTER

Prosodia Latina, An Introduction to Classical Latin Verse. By J. P. Postgate. Oxford: at the Clarendon Press (1923). Pp. v + 120. \$1.50.

This handbook stands in the same field with the Manual of Latin Prosody, by William Ramsay, now out-of-date, the excellent Quantity and Accent in the Pronunciation of Latin, by F. W. Westaway, and Res Metrika, by W. R. Hardie. Professor Postgate here writes for "learners" and for "teachers who are somewhat less than experts". "With the theses and hypotheses of the higher 'Metric' this book is not concerned". "In it for the first time *sic!* the reader and composer of Latin verse are pointed to the realities of Latin speech and protected by a special mark from the vulgar confusion of the quantity of a vowel and the quantity of a syllable".

The work is divided into two parts dealing respectively with prosody and meter. Part I presents Principles and General Rules, Peculiarities of Verse, and Words Whose Quantity Differs with their Sense. Part II has chapters on General Aspects of Meter, Different Kinds of Verse, and, in conclusion, Combinations of Verses.

On page 1 we read: "Into the structure of Latin Verse two elements enter, Quantity and Rhythm". The form of this statement seems to imply that the two are coequal, whereas they belong to different

categories, rhythm being a primary feature and quantity one of the devices by which rhythm is attained. Rhythm is defined as "the regulated recurrence of different quantities". This is an unsatisfactory statement. The word "different" as here used is ambiguous. Moreover, a learner can hardly be expected to infer from this definition the facts concerning time, measures, and the distribution of elements within the measures.

The book is marred by statements that lack clarity. One such statement is on page 6: "Since the quantity of a syllable is different if it stops with the vowel and if it includes also a consonant or consonants, we must know how speakers of Latin divided their words into syllables". A student might here infer that such a word as *īta* had syllables whose quantities were recognizably different, since the first syllable ends with a vowel and the second includes a consonant. Again we find this (page 18): "Os 'bone' is not found in verse before vowels. Nor *ac* for *atque*". A student might take this to mean that *ac* is not used in poetry for *atque*. Again (page 67): "A Latin verse is, to begin with, a fixed aggregate of Short and Long syllables". Rightly interpreted this is of course true, but the statement might be understood by some to imply that the number of syllables is fixed, which is of course not universally the case. Again (page 69): "The Rise of a foot is usually marked by an accent mark". This statement does not hold true of texts in general, nor of the majority of cases in the present book. Again (page 70): "In a strong caesura a foot is divided immediately after or immediately before a long syllable". The sentence begins in an awkward manner. The words "or immediately before" were better omitted. The statement does not cover all cases, since a strong caesura may occur before two short syllables.

These defects in the book are counterbalanced by certain points of excellence. "In speaking of words", says the author (page 71), "we mean of course not words as written or printed, but words as pronounced. And in order to understand the structure of verse, particularly in regard to caesura and diaeresis, we must bear this continually in mind". Then follow observations on the use of enclitics and proclitics that are lucid and unusually well put.

Another excellent feature is the treatment of liaison in Latin speech—a subject which the student of classical verse needs to understand but which is often left obscure in treatises on metric.

The special mark which "protects" the reader "from the vulgar confusion of the quantity of a vowel and the quantity of a syllable" is *ū*, which is placed over such a syllable as the first one of *cūrro* where the vowel is short but the syllable long. Syllables are classified as closed and open, every closed syllable being long. Scansion is spoken of as the "ascertainment of quantity" and so is distinguished from reading, with which it is sometimes confused.

The metrical schemes are designed to serve students of Vergil, Ovid, and Catullus, and of course other poets using the same meters. The division of verses into feet follows the most conservative lines, revealing

no trace of the new metric. The third line of the Alcaic stanza, to cite an example, is regarded as "a trochaic dimeter with spondees in the even places with a long or short syllable prefixed (anacrusis)". It is not likely that Horace took such a view of the verse. The major ictus is commonly regarded as belonging to the first half of a trochaic dipody and to the latter half of an iambic dipody. The author violates this distinction by marking it uniformly on the first half of a dipody whether trochaic or iambic.

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

LEON J. RICHARDSON

The Legacy of the Ancient World. By W. G. de Burgh. New York: The Macmillan Company (1924). Pp. xvi + 462.

In this comprehensive volume, The Legacy of the Ancient World, Mr. de Burgh, who is Professor of Philosophy in University College, Reading, England, essays an ambitious undertaking. His book is designed as an introduction to the study of ancient civilization for those who are unacquainted with its history. The writer is concerned with the three peoples who bequeathed a legacy that is a living power at the present day—the Hebrews, the Greeks, and the Romans.

After a short Introduction (1-10), the early civilizations of the East (Egypt, Babylonia and Assyria, the Hittites, Crete, and the Persian Empire) are briefly sketched (11-40). Then follow The Religion of Israel (41-76); The Rise of Hellenism (77-108); The Greatness of Athens (109-154); Graeco-Macedonian Culture (155-183); The Roman Republic (184-219); The Roman Empire (220-263); Christianity (264-321); The Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire (322-361); The Legacy in the Middle Age (362-408); Conclusion: On Progress and On the Living Interest of Ancient Civilization (409-434); Bibliographical Appendix (435-442); and Index (443-462).

The book, on the whole, is to be commended. Specialists in the various fields will doubtless find flaws, as the reviewer has found them in his own field, but the author writes lucidly, with a sense of proportion, and follows good authorities. In the discussion of the Hellenic legacy Mr. de Burgh has deliberately chosen to omit, for the most part, art and poetry. The prospective reader is to be warned, therefore, that he must seek elsewhere for a treatment of these all-important Greek contributions to modern civilization.

BARNARD COLLEGE,
COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY

LARUE VAN HOOK

Atheism in Pagan Antiquity. By A. B. Drachmann. London: Gyldendal (1922). Pp. ix + 168.

The contents of this book differ to a certain degree from the expectations aroused by its title, for the author states in the first lines of his Introduction that he is defining atheism not as the attitude which denies every idea of God, but as the point of view which denies the existence of the ancient gods. In this sense, he rightly says, we are now all 'atheists'. And he warns us—to this the closing chapter of the book is devoted—that this is a view of comparatively modern

origin, since until well towards the middle of the eighteenth century such an attitude was almost unknown. On the contrary, in accordance with the teachings of the Church Fathers, people thought that the ancient gods actually existed, only not as gods, but as 'demons' or creatures of the arch-fiend. One of the chief purposes of the book is to show that even in antiquity downright denial of the existence of the gods was a rare phenomenon. The writer himself asks whether it would not have been better to adopt the definition of atheism current among the ancients themselves. To prove his negative answer, he starts with an inquiry into the meaning of *atheos* and *atheotes* in antiquity. While philosophically the terms coincide with our own understanding of the word atheism, they did not do so in the popular language, where *atheos* denotes a person who denies the gods of his people and his State. He adds that, while atheism, in both senses, was punishable by law, practically the attitude both of the State and of the people towards it varied considerably, according to the intensity of the offence and according to the character of the different periods of antiquity. In fact, the term *asebeia* applies less to an expression of beliefs, though we have record of such prosecution, than to offences against public worship. For Athens, at least, no prosecutions are recorded after about 400 B. C. The Romans, though they looked at first askance at philosophers, did not deal with the question at all, until they were brought face to face with the two monotheistic religions, and even then they dealt differently with the Jew than with the Christian. Even the latter were not persecuted for their beliefs, but for their refusal to share in the public worship of pagan deities, more especially the Emperors. Here the author is at one with Mommsen, but he expressly declines to interpret the trials of the Christians as involving *maiestas*. With this statement it is well to compare Dr. Max Radin's conclusions (*The Jews in Greece and Rome*, 318 ff.) that the profession of the Christian faith was an indictable offence under Roman law from the time of Nero and that the profession of Christianity was considered a form of *maiestas*.

Professor Drachmann recognizes that *cultus* is the essence of ancient polytheism and that we must therefore distinguish between the philosopher, who, while holding his own views, still participated in public worship, and the monotheist, to whom the works of this worship are an abomination.

The main body of the book concerns itself with the discussion of the views of the former class. The author distinguishes here several groups. One consists of the Pre-Socratic philosophers, among whom he finds few instances of scepticism, notably Xenophanes, of Colophon, who, starting from popular conceptions, reached the conclusion that the gods were created in the image of man and thus directly attacked anthropomorphism, declaring that God must be One, Eternal and Unchangeable. He thus falls under the author's definition of atheist, although the ancients themselves did not consider him such. Among the Physikoi

the only one we know to have been accused of *asebeia* is Anaxagoras, of Clazomenae, the friend of Pericles. In his case, the prosecution was political—meant to strike at the statesman—rather than theological, though it was based on the denial of divinity to the celestial bodies. Professor Drachmann considers the teachings of Anaxagoras, especially his criticism of mantic, not as individual, but as common to the advanced spirits of the age, e. g. Thucydides, who is said to have been under Anaxagoras's influence. Then there is Diagoras, of Melos, who for later antiquity became the prototype of the atheist, but whose case would appear exceedingly doubtful. Real criticism of the popular religion seems first to have been spread by the Sophists, who, however, may be considered agnostics, doubters, rather than atheists, deniers. Drachmann has certainly succeeded in showing that, in spite of the attacks of Aristophanes and the conservatives, the Sophists, since they had to make their living by teaching and lecturing, could not afford to lay themselves open to a well-founded charge of atheism. Protagoras seems to have been the first to pose the question as to whether the gods existed, without answering it definitely, while Prodicus, in his investigations into the nature of metonymy, inclined to an utilitarian view, saying that the conception of gods arose from what was beneficial to mankind. But, as Drachmann points out, not to believe that wine is a god does not preclude belief in the existence of Dionysos, the god. The most interesting case is that of Critias, the tyrant, who, in his satyr drama *Sisyphos*, makes the hero say that mankind, in the evolution from a state of might to that of right, tried to check lawlessness by the invention of beings to whom all power was ascribed—a theology which finds a curious echo in a passage in Cicero (Cat. 4.8).

The study of the Sophists leads naturally to a consideration of the freethinker among the dramatists, Euripides, for whom our author denies personal views of an atheistic nature while granting (rare) instances where the poet's characters utter such views. The treatment of the Sophists also leads, as naturally, to a study of their great opponent Socrates. The charge of *asebeia* is here dealt with in detail. The final conclusion—and it seems to me correct—is that Socrates did not concern himself at all with theology, and that he was so far from opposing contemporary religion that he relied largely on it as a support for his ethics, so that the true basis of the charges against him must have been the introduction of the *daimonion*, in which Professor Drachmann, curiously enough, detects a phenomenon of clairvoyance. For Plato we are told that he was perfectly aware of the fact that the traditional gods did not fit his philosophical system at all, but that he seems to have grown less critical in his old age. In Aristotle, on the other hand, Drachmann traces a denial of the existing gods, with the exception of the celestial bodies, so that the great scientist is truly an atheist in the author's definition.

The sixth chapter deals with the Hellenistic philosophers to the founding of the Roman Empire. From

the testimony of Polybios we learn that in the second century there was a distinct attempt to break down the belief in the gods and that the historian represents the view of the educated and enlightened classes that refused to take seriously the gods and their myths. In Polybios—as earlier in Thucydides—there is a tendency to introduce the factor of Tyche (not the goddess, to be sure) into the causation of events, instead of Divine Providence. Support of the thesis of a weakened belief is also found in the teaching of Diocles and in the disrespect shown to temples as early as the time of Philip of Macedon. On the other hand, our author is disinclined to blame the influence of Hellenism for the decay of religious beliefs in Rome. Roman religion, he acknowledges, is far more ritualistic than Greek and her gods had little personality. But in this very fact he finds the reason why Roman religion was less open to philosophic attack, and he thinks rightly that the established neglect of temples and priesthoods shows that the masses themselves had ceased to believe, for the reason that Roman religion rose from the social conditions in a small farming community and failed because it fitted no longer the social and economic conditions of a world empire.

On the whole, Professor Drachmann thinks, the early philosophical schools, and especially the Stoics, preserved rather a friendly attitude toward the worship of the gods of popular belief, without which assumption, I think, we could hardly understand how they became the court philosophers of the Seleucids. Particularly interesting is the discussion of Epicurus and his sect. Drachmann states rightly that Epicurus employed the dogma of the perfection of the gods in order to preserve the popular views about them, and that the earliest conception of the *theoi reia zoontes* is in thorough harmony with the quietism of the philosopher. The Sceptics, too, though they approached agnosticism, opposed atheism, which was to them no less a dogmatism than the popular attitude was. Euhemeros, on the other hand, is a true atheist from the author's standpoint, because he declares that outside of the heavenly bodies gods no longer exist. Supporting himself by the testimony, the writer concludes that in the Rome of the first post-Christian century atheism must have been quite frequent.

Professor Drachmann, with good reason, has but a poor opinion of the importance of the so-called Augustan revival. The reaction, he thinks, did not become clearly manifest before the second century of the Christian era, where Suetonius, Aristides Rhetor, Aelian, and the revival of Pythagoreanism and Platonism are the significant symptoms. I am inclined to differ from this view, at least as far as Neo-Pythagoreanism is concerned, which I believe to have started during the century before Jesus, as witness Nigidius Figulus with his attitude toward astrology, and the eschatology of Vergil's Aeneid. Even such Cynic writers as Oenomaos and Lucian do not pillory religion so much as the swindle excrescences of superstition, and they tried merely to show that, while truly religious feeling was becoming intense, mythology was dead and therefore fair sport for ridicule.

The closing pages of the discussion of antiquity are concerned with the two monotheistic religions. Judaism, Drachmann points out correctly, is truly atheistic in his sense, since it sees in the pagan gods mere idols of wood and stone, and denies them a spiritual existence, a decided step in advance from the older parts of the Old Testament, in which Jahwe is only one god among many, though the most powerful among them. Christianity, on the other hand, is not atheistic, since it expressly recognizes the existence of the pagan deities, but sees in them, as pointed out before, demons in our modern sense. The history of this view is finally traced in some detail to the eighteenth century, with due appreciation of the advanced ideas of Giambatista Vico, until with Herder the theory of the Church is finally abandoned and the foundation laid for the splendid work of the religious investigators of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries.

The book is well translated. In closing, I may be permitted to express the hope that the Dictionary of Ancient Religions, for which the author had written his investigation, and which was stopped by the War, may be revived at no distant date.

HUNTER COLLEGE

ERNST RIESS

CLASSICAL ARTICLES IN NON-CLASSICAL PERIODICALS

VII

Coast Artillery Journal—February, 1924, The Conditions of Success in War Illustrated by Hannibal's Campaigns in Italy, Lieutenant Colonel Walter Krueger.

Education—February, 1924, The Humanities Versus the Utilities, Florence M. Bennett.

Educational Review—June, How Valuable to the Student of French is his Latin Vocabulary?, Verne G. Edgecumbe [the author holds that the Latin student does not acquire a vocabulary broad enough to give him any appreciable help in arriving at the meaning of new French words].

Harvard Theological Review—October, 1923, The Libelli of the Decian Persecution, John R. Knipfing.

Hibbert Journal—July, The Influence of Greek Scepticism on Greek and Christian Thought in the First and Second Centuries, Eugene de Faye.

High School Quarterly—January, 1924, A Proposed Reorganization of High School Latin, Peyton Jacobs.

Historical Outlook—March, 1924, Geography in the Interpretation of History, Bessie L. Ashton.—December, Use of Supplementary Readings and Fact Tests in Ancient and Medieval History, Sue W. Ralston.

History—July, History and Literature, G. M. Trevelyan.

Journal of Educational Research—March, The Influence of Latin on the Spelling of English Words, Warren W. Cox.—May, The Status of Certain Basic Latin Skills, Leo J. Brueckner.

Romanic Review—January-June, The Passive Voice in Vulgar Latin, Henri F. Muller.

CHARLES KNAPP